

Amendment
Serial No. 10/500,759

Docket No. NL 020002

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The drawings are objected to for misspelling the word "external" in FIG. 1. A replacement sheet correcting the misspelling and removing stray marks in FIG. 1 is enclosed.

Amendment
Serial No. 10/500,759

Docket No. NL 020002

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 13, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claim 16 is added. Claims 1-16 are pending, the independent claims remaining 1 and 7. Claims 4 and 10 are amended. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The drawings are objected to for misspelling the word "external" in FIG.

1. A replacement sheet correcting the misspelling and removing stray marks in FIG. 1 is enclosed.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,847,812 to Doetsch et al. ("Doetsch").

Claim 1 recites, "... the central clock frequency signal is selected such that the central clock frequency signal and the sub-frequency signals are located outside the telecommunication signal band."

Doetsch fails to disclose or suggest this aspect of claim 1.

The Office Action cites to the Detailed Description in Doetsch, all of it, without specifying what portion particularly applies.

The instant applicants accordingly submit that the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Nowhere in Doetsch, as read by applicant, is there disclosure of features cited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Doetsch fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Amendment
Serial No. 10/500,759

Docket No. NL 020002

Similarly, claim 7 recites, "... the central clock frequency signal and the sub-frequency signals are located outside of the telecommunication signal band."

Again, the Office Action cites to the Detailed Description in Doetsch, all of it.

Applicants submit that the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of anticipation as nowhere in Doetsch, as read by applicant, is there disclosure of features cited in claim 7.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Doetsch fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claim 7.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Each of the other rejected claims depends from a respective base claim that has been shown to be patentable over the cited reference and is likewise patentable.

Moreover, each warrants further consideration based on its individual, additional merits.

For example, claim 2 specifies a particular frequency range, and the Office Action cites to lines 31-41 of column 4 in Doetsch.

However, the passage the Office Action cites fails to disclose or suggest the claimed frequency range, much less the language of claim 2.

Support for the amendment of claims 4 and 10, and support for new claim 16, is found at least in [0013] of the specification.


Amendment
Serial No. 10/500,759

Docket No. NL 020002

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Waxler
Registration No. 48,027


By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Date: April 13, 2006

Mail all correspondence to:
Aaron Waxler, Registration No. 48,027
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9608
Fax: (914) 332-0615